

REMARKS

Claims 1-46 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-46 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 10, 21, and 36 have been amended. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1-46 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claim amendments and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-18, 20-23, and 29-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Martinez et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,137,468 (hereafter Martinez), in view of Armitage et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,282,082 (hereafter Armitage). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites:

An electronic system ***capable of being rotated with respect to a line of sight of a user*** and further having a first display mode, a second display mode, and a third display mode, said electronic system comprising:

- a processor coupled to a bus;
- a memory device coupled to said bus;
- a communication port coupled to said bus, wherein each display mode depends on a position of said communication port relative to said line of sight of said user, wherein said position facilitates communication with a second electronic system via said communication port;
- one or more display mode controls for selectively operating said electronic system in one of said first, said second, and said third display modes, wherein a first display orientation corresponds to said

first display mode, a second display orientation corresponds to said second display mode, and a third display orientation corresponds to said third display mode; and

an electronic display device coupled to said bus, wherein said electronic display device is configured for displaying visual data in a display orientation corresponding to a selected display mode of said electronic system, wherein each display orientation compensates for rotation of said electronic system, ***and wherein said rotation with respect to said line of sight occurs such that said rotation avoids crossing a plane on which said electronic system rests.*** (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that Martinez and Armitage do not disclose the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Martinez is directed to a computer system (e.g., laptop computer 300) having a display device. [Martinez; Figure 3; Col. 4, lines 17-26]. The orientation of the laptop system 300 is determined relative to plane 302 having an X axis and a Y axis. Id. In particular, the laptop system 300 rests on plane 302. Rotating laptop 300 around the Y axis along arrow 304 results in a change in orientation in the X value and crosses the plane 302 while rotating laptop 300 around the X axis along arrow 306 results in a change in orientation also referred as "attitude" along the Y value and crosses the plane 302. Id. Changes in "attitude" are rotations that cross the plane 302. Id. Additionally, while Figures 4A, 5A, and 6A depict the laptop 300 resting on a plane (e.g., plane 302), Figures 4B-4D, 5B-5C, and 6B-6C show the laptop 300 at different positions, wherein each position is set by rotating the laptop 300 such that the plane on which the laptop 300 initially rests is crossed (e.g., plane 302). For example, Figure 5A shows the laptop 300

in landscape mode, resting on a plane (e.g., plane 302) while Figures 5B-5C show the laptop 300 in portrait mode after being rotated such that the plane (e.g., plane 302) on which the laptop 300 rests is crossed. Movement between landscape mode and portrait mode requires crossing the plane (e.g., plane 302) on which the laptop 300 rests.

Returning to Figure 3, the laptop 300 rests on plane 302. If the Z axis is assumed to extend perpendicular to the plane 302, rotating laptop 300 around the Z axis does not result in a change in orientation in the X value or in the Y value. Moreover, this rotation around the Z axis does not cross the plane 302. However, Martinez clearly focuses on changing the display orientation ONLY when a change in the X value or the Y value is sensed. [Martinez; Col. 5, lines 24-39]. Since rotation around the Z axis does not result in change in the X value or in the Y value, no change in display orientation will occur in Martinez.

Additionally, Martinez is directed to adjusting visual components on a display device so that the components are level regardless of the position of the display device. [Martinez; Figures 4B-4D, 5B-5C, and 6B-6C; Col. 4, lines 41-43]. That is, when the laptop 300 is tilted by crossing the plane on which the laptop 300 rests (e.g., plane 302), the visual components of the display device are adjusted to compensate for the tilting. Furthermore, Martinez discloses a tilt determination block 700 at Figure 7. Also, at Figure 8, Martinez depicts a

method showing tilt Blocks (e.g., 804, 808, and 812). Continuing, at Figure 9, Martinez depicts a method showing tilt Blocks (e.g., 904, 908, and 912). Finally, at Figure 10, Martinez depicts a method showing tilt Blocks (e.g., 1004, 1006, 1012, and 1018).

Martinez does not disclose an electronic system rotated with respect to the line of sight of the user such that the rotation avoids crossing a plane on which the electronic system rests, wherein its display device displays visual data according to a display orientation that compensates for rotation of the electronic system.

Furthermore, Armitage is directed to a tablet computer system. [Armitage; Col. 2, lines 47-58]. However, Armitage does not disclose an electronic system rotated with respect to the line of sight of the user such that the rotation avoids crossing a plane on which the electronic system rests. Further, Armitage fails to show a display device that displays visual data according to a display orientation that compensates for rotation of the electronic system.

Unlike Martinez and Armitage, Independent Claim 1 is directed to an electronic system capable of being rotated with respect to a line of sight of a user. The electronic system has a display device configured for displaying visual data in a display orientation corresponding to a selected display mode. Each

display orientation compensates for rotation of the electronic system. Moreover, rotation of the electronic system with respect to the line of sight occurs such that the rotation avoids crossing a plane on which the electronic system rests. While Martinez is directed to a laptop tilted to cross a plane on which the laptop rests and is directed to adjustment of its display device based on the tilting,

Independent Claim 1 is directed to an electronic system rotated with respect to the line of sight of the user such that the rotation avoids crossing a plane on which the electronic system rests, wherein its display device displays visual data according to a display orientation that compensates for rotation of the electronic system. Also, Armitage does not disclose an electronic system rotated with respect to the line of sight of the user such that the rotation avoids crossing a plane on which the electronic system rests. Continuing, Armitage fails to show a display device that displays visual data according to a display orientation that compensates for rotation of the electronic system. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over Martinez and Armitage and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-9 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over Martinez and Armitage. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-9 are patentable over Martinez and Armitage for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 10, 21, and 36, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 10, 21, and 36 recites similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. In particular, the electronic system of Independent Claims 10, 21, and 36 is rotated with respect to the line of sight of the user such that the rotation avoids crossing a plane on which the electronic system rests, wherein its display device displays visual data according to a display orientation that compensates for rotation of the electronic system. Therefore, Independent Claims 10, 21, and 36 are allowable over Martinez and Armitage for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 11-18, 20, 22-23, 29-35, and 37-46 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 10, 21, and 36, which are allowable over Martinez and Armitage. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 11-18, 20, 22-23, 29-35, and 37-46 are patentable over Martinez and Armitage for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 19 and 24-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinez et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,137,468 (hereafter Martinez), in view of Armitage et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,282,082 (hereafter Armitage), and further in view of Kang et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,949,408 (hereafter Kang). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claims 19 and 24-28 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 10 and 21, which are allowable over Martinez and Armitage. Moreover, Kang does not disclose an electronic system that is rotated with respect to the line of sight of the user such that the rotation avoids crossing a plane on which the electronic system rests, wherein its display device displays visual data according to a display orientation that compensates for rotation of the electronic system. On the contrary, Kang shows a handheld computer device in Figure 1 in landscape mode and resting on a plane while in Figure 2 the handheld computer device is in portrait mode. Movement between landscape mode and portrait mode requires crossing the plane on which the handheld computer rests. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 19 and 24-28 are patentable over Martinez, Armitage, and Kang for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments and remarks overcome all rejections. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-46) are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 8/17/2004

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060